

Serial No. 10/714,077
Belkin et al.
Case No. CE10641R

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectively requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks. Claims 1-37 are currently pending. Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 8-11, 13, 15-16, 18-21, 24-28, and 30-37 and have cancelled claims 38-44.

In the Office Action, claims 16, 22, 24, 27, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0013163 to O'Prey. Applicant has amended independent claims 16, and made corresponding amendments to dependent claims 24 and 27, to address the rejection and has cancelled, without prejudice claims 38 and 39. The present invention as claimed in amended independent claim 16 is directed to a wireless communication unit that reformats dialed numbers according to the dialing plans from any of a plurality of different communication networks. As is described in the Specification, each of communication networks including wireless local area networks and wireless wide area networks have different dialing plans for the numbers that are used to make calls within the network. The dialing plans have rules that permit a wireless communication unit to make calls within the network. But a user of the wireless communication unit might not use the rules because the rules of the dialing plan of the network in which the unit is may be different. Amended independent claim 16 is directed to reformatting a number used to contact a target unit by using the dialing plan of the selected communication network that will be used to call the target unit.

O'Prey is not directed to reformatting dialed numbers based on the selected communication network that is used to call the target unit. O'Prey modifies dialed numbers, but the modification is not related to the dialing plan of the communication network selected by the communication unit to make the call to the target unit. Rather, O'Prey modifies the number by adding and removing prefixes to numbers to accommodate routing calls through a routing switch. In particular, O'Prey is focused on the routing of a call using prefixes within one network. O'Prey is focused on the routing of a call through a network, not on the operation of the wireless communication unit and how it selects a communications network to place a call and uses that network to reformat

Serial No. 10/714,077
Belkin et al.
Case No. CE10641R

a dialed number. O'Prey does not discuss the use of different dialing plans based on different communication networks. It is therefore respectfully submitted that O'Prey does not disclose and therefore does not anticipate the present invention as found in claim 16. As claims 22, 24 and 27 depend upon and include each and every limitation of claim 16, it is also respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are not anticipated by O'Prey. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection under Section 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 1-6, 8-15 and 28-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Prey in view of United States Patent No. 5,963,863 to Berggren and United States Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0043613 to Phillips. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 28 to further define the invention over the cited references. As with claim 16, Applicants direct claims 1 and 28 to the obtaining the reformatting rules based on dialing plan of the selected communication network used to call the target unit. As discussed above, O'Prey does not reveal using the dialing plan of the selected communication network to reformat the dialed number. Berggren is used to support the idea of a wireless device being able to operate in a plurality of communication networks. Phillips is used to support the idea of rules based implementation for translating or reformatting a dialed string. But neither Berggren nor Phillips discuss the reformatting the number based on dialing plan of the selected communication network used to call the target unit. Moreover, the Office Action does not discuss the use of the dialing plan of the selected communication network being used to reformat a dialed number. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of O'Prey, Berggren and Phillips do not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the present invention found in amended claims 1 and 28. As claims 2-6, 8-15 and 29-37 depend upon and include each and every limitation of amended claims 1 and 28, it is respectfully submitted the cited prior art do not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the dependent claims either. Applicants therefore respectfully request that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claim 7 is rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Prey, Berggren and Phillips and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,125,281 to Wells et al. Wells is used to support the idea that a user can enter prompts, but it does not address the use of the dialing plan of a selected communication network be used to reformat a number of a target unit. Thus, the arguments as to the

Serial No. 10/714,077
Belkin et al.
Case No. CE10641R

patentability of claim 1, upon which claim 7 depends, apply here. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claim 7 is not obvious in view of the cited art. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 20, 21, 25, 26, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Prey. Applicants have cancelled claim 44. For the reasons given above for the patentability of claim 16, upon which claims 20, 21, 25 and 26 depend, Applicants respectfully submit that O'Prey does not disclose teach or otherwise suggest the invention claimed. It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Prey in view of Wells. For the reasons given above with respect to differences between the present invention and O'Prey and as Wells does not provide any additional art to overcome the differences between the present invention and claim 16, upon which claim 23 depends, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 17-19 and 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Prey in view of Phillips. For the reasons given above with respect to differences between the present invention and O'Prey and as Phillips does not provide any additional art to overcome the differences between the present invention and claim 16, upon which claim 17-19 depends, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn. Claims 40-43 have been cancelled.

As the Applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the Applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No. 10/714,077
Belkin et al.
Case No. CE10641R

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to
50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,
Belkin, Anatoly S. et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 22917

By:

Simon B. Anolick

Simon B. Anolick
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 37,585
Telephone: 847-576-4234
Fax: 847-576-3750

BEST AVAILABLE COPY